



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,236	01/05/2001	Kenichiro Imai	450100-02940	3751

20999 7590 10/06/2003
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

MANOSKEY, JOSEPH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2184

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

M

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,236

Applicant(s)

IMAI ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph Manoskey

Art Unit

2184

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yano et al., U.S. Patent 5,943,498.

3. Referring to claims 1, 2, 6, and 7, Yano teaches a debug tool that is external to the system that it is monitoring via an internal processor bus (See Fig. 5). Yano also discloses a PC trace function that includes a processor bus trace function that detects data on the bus and outputs it on the external debugging interface, and includes an instruction address trace that detects the instruction execution address and outputs information to the external debugging interface (See Fig. 6, and Col. 5, lines 57 to Col. 6, lines 19). The PC trace has two modes one of which is a real time mode (See Col. 12, lines 64-67). Also the timing of accessing is output with the PC trace information using the "DCLK" signal (See Col. 8, lines 48-53).

4. Referring to claims 3, 4, 8, and 9, Yano discloses displaying the information provided by the debugging module on an external interface CRT (See Fig. 21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2184

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano et al. in view of Fasang, U.S. Patent 4,433,413.

7. Referring to claims 5 and 10, Yano teaches all the limitations (See rejection of claims 3 and 8) except for the data being displayed numerically, however Yano does disclose displaying the data on a CRT display and remains silent about what format the data is displayed in. Fasang teaches a device and method of testing a microprocessor system that includes a display where the data is formatted numerically (See Fig. 1, Col. 3, lines 20-31, and Col. 24, lines 5-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display the data in the numerical format of Fasang on the CRT display of Yano. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do this because it better conveys information to the outside world (See Fasang, Col. 3, lines 30-32).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,625,785 to Miura et al.

U.S. Patent 6,016,557 to Kasprzyk et al.

U.S. Patent 6,026,501 to Hohl et al.

U.S. Patent 6,314,530 to Mann.

U.S. Patent 6,321,331 to Roy et al.


U.S. Patent 6,615,370 to Edwards et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Manoskey whose telephone number is (703) 308-5466. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (8am to 4:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JDM
September 26, 2003


ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2184